

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated September 29, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-27, 29-31, 33-38 and 40-51. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-11, 14-16, 20-25, 27, 29-31, 33-35, 37-38, 40-46 and 48-50 are amended. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-27, 29-31, 33-38 and 40-51 remain pending upon entry of this amendment.

Interview Summary

Applicants thanks Examiner Tran for her time in conducting a telephone interview on November 13, 2009. During the telephone interview, Applicant's representatives, Greg Sueoka and Puneet Sarna, discussed the §103 rejections for claim 1 and proposed claimed amendments to clarify the claim language. During the interview, the Examiner indicated that the discussed amendment, included in the amendment made herein, is likely to overcome these rejections.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-27, 36-38, 40-48 and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowitz, et al. (US 5,485,554) in view of French, et al. (US 6,396,594). Claims 29-31 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lowitz in view of French and further in view of Freedman (US 2004/0249650). These rejections are now traversed as applied to the amended claims.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a system for printing, comprising, *inter alia*:

a user interface for receiving instructions from a user for controlling segmentation of audio or video time-based media content for printing based on one or more features within the audio or video time-based media content and for generation of a printable representation of the media content, the user interface comprising a content selection field displaying a graphical

representation of the audio or video time-based media content and the instructions from the user comprising selection of a segment of the graphical representation of the audio or video time-based media content;

The claimed invention therefore provides a system for printing time based audio or video media. The system comprises a user interface module for receiving instructions from a user for controlling segmentation of the time-based audio or video media. The user interface comprises a content selection field displaying graphical representation of the time based audio or video media content. The user can control the segment of the content to be printed by selecting part of the graphical representation in the content selection field. The media analysis module receives from the user interface module the user's selection and extracts part of the media content based on received user's selection. The media representation generation module generates a printable representation of the extracted segment and the output device prints the printable representation. The claimed invention therefore beneficially allows the user to view a representation of time-based media content and select a part of the content for printing.

The cited references, considered alone or in combination, do not disclose “a user interface ... comprising a content selection field displaying a **graphical representation of the audio or video time-based media content.**”

The Examiner agrees that Lowitz does not disclose the claimed user interface that displays a graphical representation of audio or video time-based media content. Accordingly, the Examiner cites French for disclosing this element.

French discloses a method for providing a user with the option to include a watermark on their print outs. French, abstract. A watermark can be text or graphical image. French, abstract. The user can select a watermark through a graphical user interface on the printer.

French, abstract. After the user selects a particular watermark, the graphical user interface displays a thumbnail image of the selected watermark to the user. French, fig. 4, 6:28-60.

French does not disclose the claimed user interface that displays a graphical representation of audio or video time-based media content because the disclosed watermark is not audio or video time-based media content. Instead, the watermark is an image or text that has no related time property. Because the watermark is an image or text and not time-based audio or video content, French does not disclose a user interface that displays a graphical representation of time-based audio or video media content.

Additionally, a user interface displaying a preview image of a watermark does not disclose a user interface displaying a graphical representation of time based media because displaying an image does not involve the challenges associated with displaying a graphical representation of time based media. For example, French does not resolve challenges like how to present the first five minutes of the media content such that the user can look at the five minutes of media content in the user interface and select one or more part from the displayed part. Such challenges are resolved by the claimed user interface by displaying a graphical representation of the time-based media such that a user can select part of the time base media from the displayed representation. Because a user interface displaying an image does not address the challenges faced in displaying time-based media content, such a user interface does not disclose a user interface displaying time-based audio or video media content.

Moreover, French cannot be combined with Lowitz to disclose a user interface that displays time-based audio or video media because the user interface in Lowitz also does not display time-based audio or video media content.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Lowitz and French.

Independent claim 27 includes similar elements as claim 1 and therefore claim 27 is also patentably distinguishable over Lowitz and French. The dependent claims 2-3, 5-12, 14-17, 19-26, 29-31, 33-38, and 40-51 variously depend from claims 1 and 27, and the dependent claims include the elements of their base claims. Accordingly, the dependent claims are also patentably distinguishable over Lowitz and French for at least the same reasons.

Additionally, the dependent claims include additional subject matter that further distinguishes the claims from Lowitz and French.

Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them. Additionally, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
JONATHAN J. HULL, ET AL.

Dated: December 14, 2009

/Greg T. Sueoka/
Greg T. Sueoka, Reg. No. 33,800
Attorney for Applicants
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7194
Fax.: (650) 938-5200

20412/08454/DOCS/2134134.1